



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,107	02/13/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	555255012189	3129
7590	12/28/2005		EXAMINER	
David B. Cochran, Esq. Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114			REILLY, SEAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/782,107	LAZARIDIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sean Reilly	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,44-50,52,54-56,58-60,70-80,82,83 and 85-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,44-50,52,54-56,58-60,70-80,82,83 and 85-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration filed on September 19, 2005. Claims 2, 44-50, 52, and 54-56, 58-60, 70-80, 82-83, 85-89 are presented for examination.

Affidavit Filed Under 37 CFR 1.131

1. Discussion of Applicant's affidavit filed on August 21, 2003 is moot since the subject matter in the current claims is not supported by the parent application's specification or the instant application's specification as originally filed. Refer to the discussion below with regard to the 112 1st paragraph rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 2, 44-50, 52, and 54-56, 58-60, 70-80, 82-83, 85-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The independent claims (2, 70, 85, and 89) all discuss encrypting or not encrypting messages based on certain constraints. For instance

encrypting messages if the message is a redirected message (claim 2). This feature, among others, was not described in the application as originally filed.

3. The application as originally filed disclosed the following:
 - a. **The *specification* as originally filed only mentioned the word “encrypt” three times:**
 - i. “The repackaging also permits both messages to the mobile device and sent from the mobile device to be encrypted and decrypted as well as compressed and decompressed.” Page 7, lines 2-4.
 - ii. “In preparing the message for redirection, the redirector program 12 could compress the original message A, could compress the message header, or could encrypt the entire message A to created a secure link to the mobile device 24.” Page 14, lines 2-4.
 - iii. “If the system includes encryption keys, these too can be kept at one place for management and update purposes.” Page 17, lines 4-5.

The specification (of the instant application and parent application) does not adequately describe any nexus between the handling of redirected messages versus the handling of non-redirected messages in the context of encryption. Simply put the specification failed to describe encryption with any level of detail. At best the specification merely indicated the capability of encryption. There is absolutely no discussion of *when* messages are encrypted or decrypted in Applicant’s system. It is also noted that the originally filed claims in the parent application and

instant divisional application also failed to discuss *when* messages are encrypted or decrypted in Applicant's system. Thus, all of Applicant's claims submitted on September 19, 2005 contain new matter which is not supported anywhere in the parent application or instant application as originally filed.

Applicant asserts that figure 5 and the discussion with regard to figure 5 in the specification provide support for the claim amendments. Examiner respectfully disagrees. While figure 5 may discuss the handling of messages, nowhere in figure 5 or in the discussion with regard to figure 5 is encryption mentioned or even alluded to. Again, at best the specification merely indicated the capability of encryption. Specific system functionality will not be read into Applicant's disclosure due to the mere mention of encryption. Applicant is free to argue that such specific features were well known at the time of invention and accordingly the features will be entered into the record as admitted prior art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Reilly whose telephone number is 571-272-4228. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12/21/2005



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100